

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/657,679	09/08/2000	Marc A. Edlein	D-43378-01	2639
²⁸²³⁶ CRYOVAC, IN	7590 08/10/200 JC	7	EXAM	INER
SEALED AIR CORP			MIGGINS, MICHAEL C	
P.O. BOX 464 DUNCAN, SC	29334		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
,		·	1.772	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/10/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/657,679	EDLEIN ET AL
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Michael C. Miggins	1772
The MAILING DATE of this communi	cation appears on the cover sheet wi	th the correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE M. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this comm. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum states a Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply. Any reply received by the Office later than three months a earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	AILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNION of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a runication. Itutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON will, by statute, cause the application to become AB	CATION. eply be timely filed ITHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
 Responsive to communication(s) file This action is FINAL. Since this application is in condition closed in accordance with the practice 	b) This action is non-final. for allowance except for formal matt	-
Disposition of Claims		
4)	re withdrawn from consideration.	
Application Papers		
9) The specification is objected to by the 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: Applicant may not request that any object Replacement drawing sheet(s) including 11) The oath or declaration is objected to	a) accepted or b) objected to be stion to the drawing(s) be held in abeyang the correction is required if the drawing(ce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). (s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
2. Certified copies of the priority of3. Copies of the certified copies of	documents have been received. documents have been received in A of the priority documents have been nal Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	pplication No received in this National Stage
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (P' 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	TO-948) Paper No(s	Summary (PTO-413) s)/Mail Date nformal Patent Application

Application/Control Number: 09/657,679 Page 2

Art Unit: 1772

DETAILED ACTION

REJECTIONS WITHDRAWN

There are no rejections withdrawn.

REJECTIONS REPEATED

All of the 103 rejections set forth in the non-final rejection of 12/6/06, pages 2-3, paragraphs 3-5 are repeated for the reasons of record.

NEW REJECTIONS

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. Claims 107-109 and 112 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Patrick et al. (US 6060136) in view of Elms (US 3976614).
 Patrick discloses wherein the film has a roll form (column 13, lines 19-31).
- Claims 110-111 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over
 Patrick et al. (US 6060136) in view of Elms (US 3976614), as applied to claims 1-26,
 36, 39, 56-61, 77, 87 and 93-94, 96, and further in view of Fairbanks (US 4008115).

Patrick discloses wherein the film has a roll form (column 13, lines 19-31).

ANSWERS TO APPLICANT'S ARGUMENTS

Applicant's arguments filed 5/10/07 have been carefully considered but are deemed unpersuasive.

Applicant has argued that Patrick fails to disclose that the image comprises a cured ink selected from the group consisting of radiation-cured inks and thermoset inks. However, Elms discloses thermoset inks (column 5, line 59 through column 6, line 7).

Applicant argues that Patrick does not disclose radiation cured varnishes.

However, Fairbanks discloses radiation cured varnishes (column 4, lines 15-30).

Thus the combined references read on applicant's independent claims as written.

With regard to claims 7, 32, 73, 85, 104, 50-51, 67-68, 100-101 finding the workable or optimum ranges is obvious and within the level of one of ordinary skill in the art (MPEP 2144) absent clear and convincing evidence of an unexpected result in declaration or affidavit form. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have provided applicant's claimed ranges in order to provide improved packaging properties and/or improved water resistance.

With regard to claims 8-10, 20-24 and 57-61, these claims are all drawn to the radiation-cured ink which is part of the Markush group in the independent claims.

These elements need not be disclosed since thermosetting inks are disclosed by Elms and the prior art reads on the Markush group as written. In other words since the prior art reads on the thermosetting ink in the Markush group the prior does not have to read

Art Unit: 1772

on the radiation-cured inks, or the dependent claims describing the radiation-cured inks, in the Markush group.

Applicant argues that Fairbanks fail to disclose thermoset urethane-based overprint varnish. However, Fairbanks discloses that the varnishes are thermoset since they are crosslinked (column 4, lines 15-30). The reaction products of polyisocyanate and 1,4 butanediol diacrylate is a polyurethane or very similar to a polyurethane. Therefore, Fairbanks teaches or suggests a thermoset urethane-based overprint varnish.

With regard to claims 48-49, 65-66 and 98-99, the radiation exposure comprising electron-beam radiation of a particular energy is a method limitation in a product claim. These method limitations have been given little patentable weight since method limitations are not germane to the patentability of a product in a product claim (MPEP 2113).

With regard to applicant's alleged unexpected results, applicant has not provided the allegation of unexpected results in declaration or affidavit form in accordance with MPEP 716.02(g). Furthermore, applicant has not compared the instant invention with the closest prior art Patrick, Elms and Fairbanks. Furthermore, the alleged unexpected results are not commensurate in scope with claims 1-26 because the independent claims do not recite an overprint varnish selected from the group consisting of radiation-cured varnishes or thermoset varnishes.

Conclusion

Application/Control Number: 09/657,679

Art Unit: 1772

1. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Page 5

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael C. Miggins whose telephone number is 571-272-1494. The examiner can normally be reached on 1:00-10:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rena Dye can be reached on 571-272-3186. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 09/657,679

Art Unit: 1772

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Michael C. Miggins Primary Examiner

Page 6

Art Unit 1772

MCM

August 2, 2007